

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 12 and 19-21 are independent.

II. SUPPORT FOR REMARKS IN SPECIFICATION

Support for these Remarks is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed and specifically at paragraphs [0111], [0112], [0149]-[0154] and Fig. 4 of Applicant's corresponding published application. By way of example and not limitation:

[0111] The metadata extracting section 142, configured as an extracting section associated with the present embodiment, searches for, reads, and **extracts the metadata recorded to the optical disk 60, automatically** or in response to user instruction.

[0112] **To be more specific, when the optical disk 60 is loaded on the recording/reproducing apparatus 100 for example, the metadata extracting section 142 starts the recording/reproducing unit 120 to automatically search the storage area in the optical disk 60 for metadata and their storage locations. Also, the metadata extracting section 142 can read the detected metadata partially or entirely.**


[0149] (4-2) Method of **Semi-Automatically** Displaying Metadata

[0150] **The following describes a method of semi-automatically displaying metadata onto the surface of the optical disk 60 by use of the recording/reproducing apparatus 100 with reference to FIG. 11. FIG. 11 is a flowchart describing the metadata semi-**

automatically displaying method according to the present embodiment.

[0154] Next, in step S206, a print instruction is given by user. Through the operator unit 106 of the recording/reproducing apparatus 100 or the operator unit of the editing terminal apparatus 30, the user gives an instruction for printing the metadata recorded to the optical disk 60 and/or the metadata edited in step S204 to the metadata display sheet 66 attached to the optical disk 60, for example. The recording/reproducing apparatus 100 starts displaying the metadata only upon reception of this instruction, for example. **In this point, the present operation flow differs from that of the above-mentioned metadata automatically displaying method (in which the display processing automatically starts upon loading of the optical disk 60 for example).**

FIG. 4



III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-8, 10-12, 14, 15, 18 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,833,865 to Fuller et al. (hereinafter, merely “Fuller”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,642,959 to Arai et al. (hereinafter, merely “Arai”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,476,817 to Harper et al. (hereinafter, merely “Harper”).

Claims 2, 5-6, 9, 13, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Fuller in view of Arai in view of Harper and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,102 to Bloch et al. (hereinafter, merely "Bloch").

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Fuller in view of Arai in view of Harper and in view of Bloch and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,873,435 to Tehranchi et al. (hereinafter, merely "Tehranchi").

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

...wherein when performing automatic extraction, the extracting section automatically searches storage area and storage location for the metadata in the storage medium, **the automatic searching starting in response to loading the storage medium...**(Emphasis added)

As understood by Applicant, Arai relates to an electronic camera, an electronic device, a transmission system, and a control method therefor.

Applicant submits that neither Fuller nor Arai nor Harper, taken alone or in combination, that would disclose, suggest or render predictable the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, none of the references used as a basis for rejection discloses or renders predictable "wherein when performing automatic extraction, the extracting section automatically searches storage area and storage location for the metadata in the storage medium, **the automatic searching starting in response to loading the storage medium.**" as recited in claim 1.

Specifically, the Office Action (see page 3) asserts that Arai discloses when performing automatic extraction, the extracting section automatically searches storage area and

storage location for the metadata in the storage medium, and refers to Arai, col. 1, lines 50-63, which are reproduced as follows:

Arai, col. 1, lines 50-63:

According to an aspect of the present invention there is provided an electronic camera comprising: picture capturing means for capturing a picture of a subject; input means for inputting the destination address of a location to which picture data captured by the picture capturing means is to be transmitted; storage means for storing the picture data captured by the picture capturing means and the destination address data input by the input means so that they are associated with each other; and output means for externally outputting the picture data and its associated destination address stored in the storage means.

Applicant submits that Arai teaches nothing about **the automatic searching starting in response to loading the storage medium.**

However, in the present invention, **when the optical disk is loaded on the recording/reproducing apparatus, the metadata extracting section starts the recording/reproducing unit to automatically search** the storage area in the optical disk for metadata and their storage locations. In other words, the metadata automatically displaying method of the present claimed invention is different from other displaying processing, such as metadata semi-automatically displaying method, because the display processing **automatically starts upon loading of the optical disk** (See, paragraphs [0111], [0112] and [0149]-[0154] of Applicant's corresponding published application).

Thus, Arai fails to disclose or render predictable "wherein when performing automatic extraction, the extracting section automatically searches storage area and storage location for the metadata in the storage medium, **the automatic searching starting in response to loading the storage medium,**" as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, this deficiency of Arai is not cured by the supplemental teaching of Fuller or Harper.

Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is patentable and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 8, 12 and 19-21 are also patentable, and Applicant thus respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections thereto.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Applicant thereby respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of rejections thereto. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Because Applicant maintains that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicant reserves the right to address such comments.


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800